

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 14, 16, 18 to 22, 37 and 38 were pending on the August 19, 2009, mailing date of the non-final Office Action. Independent claims 1, 37 and 38 have been amended. Reconsideration and further examination are requested.

Support

Since the substance of the amendments to the independent claims is found throughout the disclosure, including at least FIGS. 25 and 26 and the accompanying disclosure, the Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

Double Patenting

Claims 1 to 14, 16, 18 to 22, 37 and 38 were provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 2, 5 to 15, 16, 17, 20 to 29, 31 and 33 to 34 of co-pending U.S. Pat. App. No. 10/628,565 ("the '565 application"). The independent claims have been amended to recite the non-obvious feature of "when the selected actual task comprises neither a type SPLIT task or a type ACTIVITY task, traversing the first workflow in a first direction to find a type JOIN task, and traversing the first workflow from the type JOIN task in a second direction to find a type SPLIT task," which is not recited by any claim of claims of the '565 application. Withdrawal of the provisional rejection is requested.

Rejections to Specification

As requested by the Examiner, the specification has been amended to recite the features of "a computer-readable medium with a computer program including instructions that, when executed, operate to cause a computer to perform operations," and "one or more computers and a computer-readable medium coupled to the one or more computers having instructions stored thereon which, when executed by the one or more computers, cause the one or more computers to perform operations." These features are acknowledged by the Office Action to be inherently disclosed. *See Office Action, pg. 5.* Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1 to 14, 16 and 18 to 22, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, have been amended to recite the feature of an “apparatus,” thereby “positively reciting” the machine to which it is tied,” as requested. See Office Action, pg. 6 (emphasis original). Withdrawal of the § 101 rejection is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 to 14, 16, 18 to 22, 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Schulz et al., “Architecting Cross-Organisational B2B Interactions,” (“Schulz”) in view of Shen et al., “Coordinating Interorganizational Workflows Based on Process-Views” (“Shen”). Withdrawal of the § 103 rejection is requested.

Applicants have amended each of the independent claims to express in more clear and expansive form the features that distinguish the claimed inventions over the applied references. For instance, the independent claims now recite the following features, which are not disclosed or rendered obvious by Schulz or Shen:

- receiving a first user input selecting one of the first plurality of actual tasks that the user intends to be maintained as confidential
- when the selected actual task comprises a type SPLIT task, traversing the first workflow in two directions to find two type JOIN tasks, one task in each direction
- when the selected actual task comprises a type ACTIVITY task, traversing the first workflow in two directions to find two adjacent tasks, one task in each direction
- when the selected actual task comprises neither a type SPLIT task or a type ACTIVITY task, traversing the first workflow in a first direction to find a type JOIN task, and traversing the first workflow from the type JOIN task in a second direction to find a type SPLIT task
- identifying a respective path from the selected actual task to each of the type JOIN tasks, to each of the adjacent tasks, or to the type JOIN task and the type SPLIT task
- providing one or more of the paths as possible user selections

- receiving a second user input selecting one of the paths, the selected path including at least the selected one of the first plurality of actual tasks
- abstracting the selected path in the first workflow view

In view of the foregoing, the asserted references fail to disclose or render obvious each of claims 1, 37, and 38. Consequently, each of the dependent claims define over the asserted references for at least the same reasons. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Applicant : Karsien Schulz, et al.  
Serial No. : 10/628,561  
Filed : July 29, 2003  
Page : 15 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 13909-0026003 / 2003P00499  
US

### CONCLUSION

All of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reason for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to amendment.

The undersigned attorney welcomes the opportunity to further discuss by telephone any position or issue not fully addressed by the above remarks and amendments.

No charges are due. Please apply all charges not otherwise paid or apply any credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ryan McCarthy  
Reg. No. 50,636

Date: September 24, 2009

Customer No. 32864  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (512) 472-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

11081722.doc